



Principal Project Advisory Team (Phase 2)
Wednesday, January 31, 2018 (10:30 am – 3:00 pm)
New York State School Board Association
24 Century Hill Drive, Latham, NY (Lashway Conf Center)

If leadership is “influencing others to work toward a stated end”ⁱ and “leadership and learning are indispensable to each other,”ⁱⁱ then principal preparation is an exercise in developing “learning-centered leadership.”ⁱⁱⁱ

When focus shifts from “teaching to learning, when learning becomes the preoccupation, and when all of a school’s educators examine efforts through the lens of the impact on learning, the structure and culture of school change.”^{iv}

At moments such as these, the call to principals is to unify the “thoughts and actions of faculty, staff, and parents on learning – not only student learning, but their own learning as well.”^v

1. Welcome, member introductions, greeting of visitors and newcomers (10:30 am)
2. Meeting Goal: Develop 1-3 preliminary recommendations for each area our 5-part charge
3. What transpired since we last met: Feds approved *Every Student Succeeds Act* plan for NYS (3% of Title IIA funds for principal prep)
4. Housekeeping: Review and accept or agree on any needed change to minutes from meeting #1 (see meeting #1 evaluation results)
5. Logic Models (10:35 am)
Objective: Recognize *ESSA* requires states to develop and use a logic model when using Title funds to support principal preparation
Objective: Decide whether to create a logic model that ties together recommendations we generate in response to 5-part charge
 - Use RAND publication to identify the components and value of a logic model
 - Use exemplar logic model from Illinois to understand how a logic model for our work might be organized
 - Gauge whether members support developing a logic model for our work
6. SurveyMonkey Results Related to “First Principles” (10:40 am)
Objective: Consider whether adopting “first principles” will help bring coherence to the recommendations emerging from our work
 - Review survey responses
7. Priming the Pump (10:45 am)
Objective: Understand how competency-based assessment is used by other states and how it can inform our project
 - Terry Orr (Fordham) provides context on competency-based assessment (Massachusetts’ *Performance Assessment of Leaders*)
8. Break-out Session for Small Work Groups (11:25 am)
Objective: Develop 1-3 preliminary recommendations for each area our 5-part charge

Universal questions that are suitable for any small group

- How does each preliminary recommendation we develop measure up against our identified success criteria?
 - Is consistent with beliefs and recommendations identified by Principal Preparation Project Advisory Team
 - Supports elements of the Regent vision and the *ESSA* plan for NYS
 - Educationally sound (consistent with the published positions of national boards and experts)
 - Credible (supported by those who support is needed)
 - Creates system coherency (e.g., consistent with or advances current policy and practice in a sensible way)
 - Fiscally viable (can be adopted and implemented within existing resources)
 - If fed funds are used, conforms to the evidence-based requirements of *ESSA* (concerning use of Title I and IIA funds)

Questions for Small Group on Competency Based Assessment (in this context the term “SBL” means School Building Leader)

- Should NYS follow the path taken by Massachusetts (and now also by California); why or why not?
- If NYS forgoes the Massachusetts way; what mechanism will assure judgments of competency are comparable across NYS?
- Do we recommend competency-based assessment: (a) replace SBL exam (b) augment SBL exam or (c) do not replace exam?

Questions for Small Group on Micro Credentials

- With respect to issuing micro credentials, to ensure comparability of judgments, who is responsible to whom and for what?
- What role could and should NYSED play when it comes to issuing micro credentials (what mechanism will assure quality)?
- How will it work (and what role might incentives play)?

Questions for Small Group on University Based Preparation Program Standards

- Given a cross-walk of NELP/PSEL/MCEAP, do we know enough to now recommend standards for university prep programs?
- What is the best way forward given equity, cultural responsiveness, and parent engagement are chief organizing concepts?
- Assuming we recommend new standards, by what mechanism will institutions smooth transition to the updated standards?

Questions for the Small Group on Standards for Supervisors (in this context, the term “SDL” refers to School District Leaders)

- Could or should “supervisor standards” that we recommend pertain to supervisor preparation, supervisor practice, or both?
- If equity and cultural responsiveness are a focus of principal prep and/or practice under PSEL what does this mean for SDLs?
- In what way, to what extent, and why do we recommend modifications to the 2015 supervisor standards (from CCSSO)?

Questions for the Small Group on P20 Partnerships

- What does it mean to re-design prep programs so all graduates are equipped to turn around schools that struggle most?
- How will re-designed partnerships surmount obstacles that now impede current prep, leaving many certified yet few ready?
- When it comes to boundaries on creativity & innovation what characteristics will we expect of all re-designed partnerships?

9. Working lunch (12:25 pm)

- Gather lunch, continue small group work, but be ready to re-convene as a whole group when a 2-minute video clip ends.

10. Q-Storm Session (12:40 pm)

Objective: Offer feedback to each small group concerning their preliminary recommendations.

- Reconvene as a whole group.
- One by one each group presents recommendations (each small group is limited to 2 minute presentation).
- After small group presentation, members of entire team pose questions “I wonder whether . . . ?” “Have you considered . . . ?”
- A total of 12 minutes is set aside for a Q-Storm for each small group

11. Reconvene as small groups (1:40 pm)

Objective: Revise preliminary recommendations of each small group in light of feedback from members of Phase 2 Advisory Team

- Each small group uses feedback to improve recommendation(s)

12. Reconvene and re-engage with the whole group (2:40 pm)

Objective: Understand changes to preliminary recommendations made by each small group in response to Advisory Team feedback.

- Each small group presents revised recommendations (total of 3 minutes is set aside for each small group)
- Co-leaders for each small group focus on changes.
- Whole group discussion.
- If requested by co-leaders, use Fist to Five to identify how many and which recommendations enjoy support of entire team

13. Adjourn (3:00 pm)

ⁱ Fry-Ahearn, B. and Collins, D., “*Getting it Right: Designing Principal Preparation Programs that Meet District Needs for Improving Low-Performing Schools*”, Southern Regional Education Board, SREB 2016, p. 4

ⁱⁱ Kennedy, J. F., JFK Presidential Library, remarks that President Kennedy prepared for delivery on November 22, 1963 at the Trade Mart in Dallas, Texas [undelivered] Ahearn and Collins, p. 4, This argument is advanced by the Southern Regional Education Board in its most recent efforts involving system re-design.

^{iv} DuFour, R. “What is a Professional Learning Community?” , *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 61, No. 8, May , 2004, p 6-11,

^v DuFour, R. 2004, p. 6-11